

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the review of the present application.

Applicant would like to point out that although the Office Action states it is “responsive to communications filed on 31 December 2007”, the previous communication from the Applicant was on 17 November 2007 (See Response to Office Action dated 17 November 2007).

#### **In the Claims**

Claims 1-66 are pending. Claims 1, 21, 36 and 49 have been amended. Claims 67-84 are new. No new matter had been added.

#### **Rejections under 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,638,737 (hereinafter “Mattson”) in view of U.S. 6,109,881 (hereinafter “Snodgrass”).

Mattson, in view of Snodgrass, does not disclosure, teach or suggest all of the elements as claimed in independent current claims 1, 21, 36 or 49. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Mattson nor Snodgrass teaches or otherwise suggests bezels and bezel assemblies for delivering pneumatic pressure as in the presently claimed invention. Rather, Mattson relates to a mechanical pumping mechanism in which pistons 40a, 40b are mechanically reciprocated back and forth, with each piston 40a, 40b including splines 44 which, among other things, allow the piston to invert as the piston is moved back and forth between a fully retracted position and a fully advanced position. Mattson does not use pneumatic pressure to operate pumps. Snodgrass relates to pneumatically operated diaphragm pumps that do not use bezels or bezel assemblies within the context of the subject patent application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mattson simply does not teach the limitations suggested by the Examiner and therefore Mattson fails to contribute the claim elements

suggested by the Examiner. As a result, to the extent Mattson could be combined with Snodgrass as suggested by the Examiner, such combination clearly would not include each and every one of the claimed limitations.

For example, the Examiner states that Mattson includes “each port 52 providing a solvent bondable tubing connection 48a and 48b to the bezel.” See current Office Action page 2. In fact, reference numerals 48a and 48b refer to pressure sensors that are situated within the inner hubs of the pistons 40. See Mattson, col. 4, lines 27-30. The Examiner agrees with this interpretation, as the Examiner stated in the current Office Action at page 8, that “elements 48a and 4(8)b are in fact pressure sensors”. The Examiner further argues that “each (pressure sensor) forms the top of a tubular section...which delivers a pressure to element 52”. See current Office Action, page 8. The Examiner states that the “tube as claimed is required to deliver a pneumatic pressure however this does not limit an invention to delivering pressure directly with the working fluid (air) to the surface or element subject to the pressure”. See current Office Action page 8.

Applicants’ amendments to claims 1, 21, 36 and 49 have made this argument moot. Mattson, as modified by Snodgrass, does not disclose, teach or suggest “each cavity in fluid communication through the rigid block with one of the ports for delivering pneumatic air pressure directly to the port through the solvent bondable tubing connection”. See amended claims 1, 21, 36 and 49.

As each of claims 1, 21, 36 and 49 include each cavity in fluid communication through the rigid block with one of the ports for delivering pneumatic air pressure directly to the port through the solvent bondable tubing connection, each of claims 1, 21, 36 and 49 have been shown to be allowable over Mattson and Snodgrass.

Thus, as claims 1, 21, 36 and 49 have been shown to be allowable over Mattson in view of Snodgrass, claims 2-20, 22-35, 37-48 and 50-66 are also allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims. For these reasons and others, some of which are discussed above, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-66 under 35 USC §103(a).

### **Conclusion**

All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Michelle Saquet Temple, if it will assist further examination of this application.

Applicants request that \$810.00 be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383 to cover the fee for the Request for Continued Examination. Applicants petition for a three month extension of time. Applicants request that the associated extension fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383. Applicants also request that any other fee required for timely consideration of this application be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383.

Date: August 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michelle Saquet Temple/

Michelle Saquet Temple  
Registration No. 48,834  
Attorney for Applicants

DEKA Research & Development Corp.  
340 Commercial Street  
Manchester, NH 03101-1129  
Tel: (603) 669-5139  
Fax: (603) 624-0573